

Application No. 09/863,095

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 12 has been amended to correct the typographical error noted in the Office Action. No narrowing amendment is intended.

The objections to the drawings are noted. Formal drawings will be submitted upon an indication of allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 6-9 and 16 have been rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,590,592 to Nason et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be supported by Nason et al. The Nason et al. patent describes techniques for implementing a parallel GUI on a user's computer that can operate distinctly from the GUI of a conventional operating system, yet share the available display space therewith. An alternate embodiment is described by Nason et al. at Cols. 17-18 for a "Netspace" combined controller/browser. Unlike the present invention that sends a "service request" across a network to a "server," the Netspace embodiment of Nason et al. is local to the user's computer. "The combined controller/browser may be an application running on the operating system, or may include an operating system kernel of varying complexity ranging from dependent on the utility operating system for hardware service system services to a parallel system independent of the utility operating system and capable of supporting dedicated applications." (Col. 17, lines 31-37). There is simply no discussion or teaching in Nason et al. of how a server that is remote from and networked to a user's computer would receive a "service request" and process that service request in the manner set forth in

Application No. 09/863,095

claims 6-9 or 16 to produce a "packaged reply" that is set up for a response to be decoded by a conventional browser to achieve the effect of tiled or cascaded windows.

It is respectfully submitted that Nason et al. actually teaches away from the claimed invention. Instead of suggesting to a person of ordinary skill in the art to look at how to achieve multiple windows by using coding of a "packaged reply" generated at a server level, Nason et al. is exclusively directed to teaching of how to implement multiple windows by altering the operating system, for example, on the user's computer to provide for a parallel window display. Such a solution is, at best, a variation on one of the many "thick-client" browser application programs that were discussed and distinguished from the claimed invention in the background section of the application.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established as not all claim limitations of independent claims 6 and 16 are taught by the Nason et al. patent. Because dependent claims 7-9 further define independent claim 6, not all claim limitations of these dependent claims are taught by the Nason et al. patent. Withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nason et al. patent in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,177,936 to Cragun. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be supported by the proposed combination of Cragun with Nason et al. for the reasons already discussed with

Application No. 09/863,095

respect to Nason et al. and because, even if Nason et al. were relevant to the claimed invention, there is no motivation or suggestion for combining Cragun with Nason et al.

The Cragun patent describes a browser that "displays multiple web pages in multiple windows in a parent-child hierarch on a display screen." (Col. 2, lines 7-8). The focus of the Cragun patent is on presenting a visual map to a user of the parent-child relationship among multiple web pages displayed while navigating through a given website. The cascade button 727 described visually presents the crumbs of the trail left by a user in navigating a given website to quickly show the user where they have been. These "trail crumbs" are presented as multiple overlapped smaller windows in a single display with the overlapping of the multiple windows signifying the parent-child relationship among the windows. Unlike the Nason et al. patent, which is directed to a parallel display scheme and user interface that is implemented on the user's computer, the Cragun patent is directed to web navigation.

By contrast, independent claims 1 and 13-15 all claim a service request from a browser client to a server, and the server packaging a reply for the browser client in response to the service request that causes or instructs the browser client to obtain or manage content information in a particular way.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Nason et al. patent nor the Cragun patent, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above claim limitations of independent claims 1 and 13-15. Neither patent relied upon in the Office Action for rejecting these claims teaches or suggests, for example, the packaged reply causing or instructing the browser client to issue a plurality of service requests for obtaining the content on the network and to display each response to the service requests as one of a cascaded series of pages of content information

Application No. 09/863,095

within a single frame, as claimed in claims 1 and 13-14. Likewise, neither relied-upon patent teaches or suggests, for example, the packaged reply containing instructions as to whether the browser client will manage displaying of a cascaded series of content information, as claimed in claim 15.

Furthermore, because the Nason et al. patent teaches specialized hardware or software layers for implementing the parallel GUI scheme, the Nason et al. patent teaches away from the "thin-client" approach achieved by the invention claimed in independent claims 1 and 13-15, and instead suggests a "thick-client" approach, similar to the other thick-client search engine packages describe in the Background of the Invention section of the present patent application. Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation for why a person skilled in the art would combine the Cragun patent on web navigation with the Nason et al. patent on a thick-client approach to parallel user interfaces.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of the obviousness of independent claims 1 and 13-15 has not, and cannot, be established by the proposed combination of the Nason et al. and Cragun patents, even if there were a suggestion or motivation for such a combination, which there is not. Furthermore, because dependent claims 2-5 further define independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/863,095

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Brad Pedersen
Registration No. 32,432

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5774